



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/734,368	12/12/2003	Per Sauerberg	6594.200-US	2809
23650	7590	03/06/2007	EXAMINER	
NOVO NORDISK, INC. PATENT DEPARTMENT 100 COLLEGE ROAD WEST PRINCETON, NJ 08540			KEYS, ROSALYND ANN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1621	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	03/06/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/734,368	SAUERBERG ET AL.
	Examiner Rosalynd Keys	Art Unit 1621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 December 2006.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-73 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-4,9-11,16-22,24,26-28,32-34,38-52,54 and 63-69 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 58, 59 & 61 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) 1-73 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/19/04 & 1/14/05</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims withdrawn from consideration are 5-8,12-15,23,25,29-31,35-37,53,55-57,60,62 and 70-73.

Art Unit: 1621

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. Claims 1-73 are pending.

Claims 1-4, 9-11, 16-22, 24, 26-28, 32-34, 38-52, 54 and 63-69 are rejected.

Claims 5-8, 12-15, 23, 25, 29-31, 35-37, 53, 55-57, 60, 62 and 70-73 are withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 58, 59, and 61 are objected.

Election/Restrictions

2. Applicant's election without traverse of Group I and the species (S,S)-3-[4-[3-(4'{3-[4-(2-Carboxy-2-ethoxy-ethyl)-phenoxy]-propyl}-3,3'-bis-trifluoromethyl-biphenyl-4-yl)-propoxy]-phenyl]-2-ethoxy-propionic acid in the reply filed on December 20, 2006 is acknowledged.

3. Claims 5-8, 12-15, 23, 25, 29-31, 35-37, 53, 55-57, 60, 62 and 70-73 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in the reply filed on December 20, 2006.

Information Disclosure Statement

4. The examiner has considered the information disclosure statements submitted on February 19, 2004 and January 14, 2005.

Specification

5. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

6. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: The specification does not provide support for the limitation C₁₋₃-alkoxy, as disclosed in claims 40 and 45.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 1621

8. Claims 66 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

9. A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. See MPEP § 2173.05(c). Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claim 66 recites the broad recitation about 0.05 mg to about 1000 mg, and the claim also recites preferably from about 0.1 to about 500 mg and especially preferred from about 0.5 mg to about 200 mg which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

11. Claims 1-4, 9-11, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 24, 26, 27, 32, 33, 38-52 and 63-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sauerberg et al. (WO 01/79150 A1).

Sauerberg et al. teach the claimed invention at page 3, line 16 to page 4, line 4; page 8, line 1 to page 10, line 3; page 15, line 20 to page 16, line 15; page 17, lines 23-31; and examples 3 and 5.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 1621

12. Claims 1-4, 9-11, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 24, 26, 27, 32, 33, 38-52, 54, 63-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sauerberg et al. (US 2003/0109579 A1)

The applied reference has a common inventor with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Sauerberg et al. teach the claimed invention (see entire disclosure, in particular paragraphs 0038-0154 and 0342-0394).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

15. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

16. Claims 18, 21, 28, 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sauerberg et al. (WO 01/79150 A1).

Art Unit: 1621

Sauerberg et al. teach the claimed invention, but fail to expressly disclose a compound wherein D and E are isopropyl and T and U are ethylene or propylene. However, Sauerberg et al. suggest the claimed invention, since Sauerberg et al. disclose compounds which have close structural similarity to the claimed compounds and similar utility. When chemical compounds have "very close" structural similarities and similar utilities, without more a *prima facie* case may be made. See for example *In re Wilder*, 563 F.2d 457, 195 USPQ 426 (CCPA 1977) (adjacent homologues and structural isomers); *In re May*, 574 F.2d 1082, 197 USPQ 601 (CCPA 1978) (stereoisomers); *In re Hoch*, 428 F.2d 1341, 166 USPQ 406 (CCPA 1970) (acid and ethyl ester). When such "close" structural similarity to prior art compounds is shown, in accordance with these precedents the burden of coming forward shifts to the applicant, and evidence affirmatively supporting unobviousness is required.

17. Claims 18, 21, 28 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Sauerberg et al. (US 2003/0109579 A1).

The applied reference has a common inventor with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). This rejection might also be overcome by showing that the reference is disqualified under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) as prior art in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and § 706.02(l)(2). Sauerberg et al. teach the claimed invention, but fail to expressly disclose a compound wherein D and E are isopropyl and T and U are ethylene or propylene. However, Sauerberg et al. suggest the claimed invention, since Sauerberg et al. disclose compounds which have close structural similarity to the claimed compounds and similar utility. When chemical compounds have "very close" structural similarities and similar utilities, without more a *prima facie* case may be made. See for example *In re Wilder*, 563 F.2d 457, 195 USPQ 426 (CCPA 1977) (adjacent homologues and structural isomers); *In re May*, 574 F.2d 1082, 197 USPQ 601 (CCPA 1978) (stereoisomers); *In re Hoch*, 428 F.2d 1341, 166 USPQ 406 (CCPA 1970) (acid and ethyl ester). When such "close" structural similarity to prior art compounds is shown, in accordance with these precedents the burden of coming forward shifts to the applicant, and evidence affirmatively supporting unobviousness is required.

Art Unit: 1621

Allowable Subject Matter

18. Claims 58, 59 and 61 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rosalynd Keys whose telephone number is 571-272-0639. The examiner can normally be reached on M, W & F 5:30-7:30 am & 1-5 pm; T & Th 5:30 am-4 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman Page can be reached on 571-272-0602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Rosalynd Keys
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1621

March 5, 2007